TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Friday, February 5, 2010
10:00 AM - 2:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Conference Room 106

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT
Mohyeddin Abdulaziz*	Jennifer Gilbertson
Lillith Avalon*	Joan Harphant
Steve Ballance	Jeremiah Matthews
Ron Bitterli	Jared Phelan
Karl Heckart, Chair	Kyle Rimel
Randy Kennedy	
Cary Meister	
Jared Nishimoto	
Eloise Price	
Rick Rager	
David Stevens	

GUESTS	AOC STAFF
Zona Cecil, *Phoenix Muni Court*	Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Richard Eaton*, *Coconino County IT*	William Earl, *ITD*
Nick Felber, *Yuma Superior Court*	Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Christy Koehler, *Gilbert Muni Court*	Valarie Strayer, *ITD*

* indicates appeared via telephone

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS | Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and provided an update on the budget situation and its possible impacts on technology projects work. All project work is still full steam ahead until we hear otherwise. Karl also shared details of a recent meeting with the County Supervisors' Association about the prospects for increased collaboration between the courts and the counties. Two meetings a year will be held to increase communication and coordination between courts and county technology organizations. Karl stated that the court community needs to determine where we "defend the fence" and where we take advantage of efficiencies that stem from increased inclusion in local services. Members expressed nervousness about being blindsided by decisions made in the meetings with county personnel. The topic of areas for potential collaboration will be added to the agenda for the April TAC meeting.

Staff confirmed that a quorum existed.

UPDATE | KEY PROJECT UPDATES | Karl Heckart

Karl briefed members on the progress of certain state-level initiatives:

- Certification of Messrs. Heckart, Rager, and Bruner as faculty for the Institute for Court Management's "Managing Technology Projects and Resources" module to be taught in state. The initial class will be held April 13 through 15.
- e-Filing through AZTURBOCOURT.GOV, including expansion of pay and print efforts, integration with Maricopa Clerk's Office for civil subsequent filings, and case initiating filing efforts with the Pima Clerk's Office. The timeline is taking longer than planned.
- The recent publication of an RFP for selection of a vendor to support and maintain the OnBase EDMS in courts throughout the state. The current contract with OSAM expires June 15, 2010. Evaluation team members are being contacted and will begin work after the March 16 public opening of proposals.
- Changes to the OnBase/AJACS integration strategy with the net release of AJACS to eliminate the need to recycle every attached OnBase server whenever AJACS has to be recycled.
- Progress on the AJACS rollout in superior courts. The LJ CMS version 3.4 has been received and will be installed for testing next week.
- Interest in use of a product called ROME, marketed by AmCad, to replace various aging data warehouse functions at the state level. Discussion focused on its implications at the local level.

DISCUSS | EA TABLE REVIEW/UPDATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 | William Earl

Karl re-introduced the biennial update of the architecture targets for courts. Redlined changes to the table were circulated by staff member Stewart Bruner for review by members; he heard nothing indicating those items were unacceptable. Today's focus is on reaching consensus about those few items requiring further research that were placed in the parking lot at the previous meeting.

1. Stored data encryption – The most expedient solution is to require all court data existing on mobile devices to be backed up to court servers. The communications policy (ACJA

1-503 D.2.d) requirement that AOC be given a key for any encrypted court record is insufficient without either selection of a standard software solution or providing a copy of any encryption software product used to the AOC. Maricopa Superior Court is participating in a product trial with the county, members agreed to wait for their results before specifying any standard product. In the meantime, the requirement needs to indicate that AOC needs both key and copy of the encryption software for all encrypted court records.

2. e-Mail encryption – No current pressure exists for definition of a standard, but members expressed concern that confidential information is being transmitted via regular e-mail today. Karl stated that he leaned toward the key and software being stored at AOC for e-mail as well as for static encrypted court records, as discussed above. This can also be revisited after the Maricopa encryption trial mentioned above.

3. e-Signature method – The issue persists year after year while no funding exists to implement a comprehensive solution like third-party key escrowing. Members felt comfortable with "self-sign" solutions when accomplished using a trusted network but continued to focus on various "what-if" scenarios for authentication related to off-network documents both coming into and departing from the court. Ron Bitterli will send Stewart details of the Maricopa COSC eSeal application that provides authenticated documents for use by the Sheriff to see if the approach might work as a state standard.

4. ftp – All agree ftp poses a risk. MQ is not a realistic solution outside the court system. Web services is the most viable alternative but carries a cost to adopt and requires vendor code changes. Karl warned members to inform vendors that the new case management system will not be accepting bulk data transfers via ftp. Consensus formed on separating standards for internal transfers from those for external transfers and adding a comment regarding the courts' overall direction. MQ remains the requirement for internal transfers while a new row will be added for external transfers specifying both MQ and web services.

Following documentation of these items and final agreement by members, the table will be presented for formal approval at the COT annual meeting.

UPDATE	COCONINO VIRTUAL BARCODE SHEET DEMONSTRATION	Richard Eaton

Richard Eaton from Coconino County IT walked members step-by-step through the workings of the solution created to replace OnBase's Application Enabler Module after AZTEC was replaced by AJACS. The overarching principles were to not print barcodes and to automate as much of the entire scanning process as possible for clerks. Richard reviewed the savings and process efficiencies introduced by the automation and then answered members' detailed questions about the inner workings of the various technical portions of the solution. Members raised concerns about the costs of the various OnBase components employed as well as the Coconino Clerk's approach to workflow in comparison to the approach used in their courts.

REVIEW	RECOMMENDATION OF XML FORMAT FOR OUTBOUND COURT DOCUMENTS	Karl Heckart

Karl reminded members of their previous recommendation that separate standards be established for presentation and distribution of electronic documents to the public, stemming from the need to "fix" the format of documents and protect them from being edited by the public. He then summarized e-Courts' recent discussion about whether electronically distributed documents were official court records or not, as summarized in Issue 17. e-Court was comfortable with distributing editable documents as long a they were somehow accompanied by a disclaimer indicating that their use was for reference only and that official records must be obtained from the applicable clerk or court. Discussion gravitated toward how many formats of documents to store and whether to convert all to a single format before presenting them or simply present them in whatever format they are stored. Stewart reminded members of Justice Hurwitz' adage: "Don't design a solution around the 2 percent condition; tackle the 98 percent now and we'll work out the 2 percent as specific issues arise."

The group as a whole was comfortable with displaying electronic records in the format in which they are stored by default. Open Document Format and Open Office XML would therefore be allowable XML formats for presentation and distribution of electronic documents to the public as well as for receipt of documents filed by the public.

| MOTION | **A motion was made and seconded to recommend, in light of e-Court's policy decision on Issue 17, that electronic documents be displayed in the native format in which they are stored. The motion passed unanimously.** | |

| REVIEW / APPROVE | **SPECIFICATION CHANGES FOR DEFENSIVE DRIVING PHASE 2** | Cynthia Thomas |

Cynthia Thomas, project manager for the defensive driving application rewrite, described changes in three specific tags needed in the specification. The impact involves the way case management systems will process the financial data being provided to them in the payment record. A new record type, "P," must also be added.

| MOTION | **A motion was made and seconded to approve the changes to the defensive driving specification package as distributed to members, with the addition of the new document type "P" and corresponding update of the notation in the manifest. The motion passed unanimously.** | |

Cynthia will provide the changed documents for Stewart to post in place of the items currently provided on the COT Documents Enterprise Architecture Standards webpage, http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/Documents/EAS/EAS.htm.

| UPDATE | **NCOA WITH NEW JURY+ RELEASE** | Jared Nishimoto |

Jared Nishimoto from Coconino Superior Court briefed members on national change of address (NCOA) requirements from the United Stated Postal Service (USPS) that affects bulk, first-class mail sent by courts. With the cost per returned piece of mail being estimated at one dollar, costs

associated with ensuring addresses are valid and belong to the specific jurors or court users become easier to justify. Jared shared the savings realized by his court in beta testing last fall and extrapolated the savings to a larger volume court like Yuma. He differentiated between the address validation/cleansing being done by courts today apart from Jury+ and the minimum NCOA compliance provided by Jury+ for an estimated $1000 one time and $50 per 18-month run. For an additional fee, address changes can be checked over a longer period of time. The module will pay for itself very quickly.

UPDATE	TARGETED LOCAL COURT TECHNOLOGY TOPICS	Various

Members and staff shared various items:

- Stewart provided details about the Arizona Digital Government Summit May 18 and 19 at the Hyatt Regency in Phoenix. There is no registration cost for government employees. COJET credit is possible to obtain.
- Ellie Price described work underway in Gila Superior Court to prepare for the AJACS conversion. Clerks are also trapping minute entries that should not be appearing in the public access repository.
- Karl informed members that the Supreme Court website will be converting to a content management approach over the next few months, beginning March 18.
- Rick Rager gave an update on the health of the Tempe CMS and on other automation-related work underway in Tempe.
- Yuma is pursuing RevQ collections tracking in a software-as-a-service model. Crystal Reports with a timer is providing the input to RevQ.
- Certain courts are shifting their credit card payments to outside providers (like Site Pay or Official; Payments) in order to avoid the merchant fees. Other courts are sending payers to AZCourtPay and having the FARE vendor pick up the merchant fee tab.
- Randy Kennedy described the functioning of the e-Subpoena application for employees of the City of Scottsdale required in court.
- AZTEC 1.53 will be piloted for a month prior to its general release to the courts at the end of March.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC	Karl Heckart

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, Karl adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:	April 2, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 230
	August 6, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 230

MEETING ADJOURNED	2:10 PM